

τ -RIGID MODULES FROM TILTED TO CLUSTER-TILTED ALGEBRAS

Stephen Zito*

August 9, 2016

Abstract

We study the module categories of a tilted algebra C and the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra $B = C \ltimes E$ where E is the C - C -bimodule $\text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$. In particular, we study which τ_C -rigid C -modules are also τ_B -rigid B -modules. In the special case M is an indecomposable τ_C -rigid module or a τ_C -tilting module, we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for M to be a τ_B -rigid B -module.

1 Introduction

We are interested in studying the representation theory of cluster-tilted algebras which are finite dimensional associative algebras that were introduced by Buan, Marsh, and Reiten in [15] and, independently, by Caldero, Chapoton, and Schiffler in [18] for type $\mathbb{A}$.

One motivation for introducing these algebras came from Fomin and Zelevinsky's cluster algebras [20]. Cluster algebras were developed as a tool to study dual canonical bases and total positivity in semisimple Lie groups, and cluster-tilted algebras were constructed as a categorification of these algebras. To every cluster in an acyclic cluster algebra one can associate a cluster-tilted algebra, such that the indecomposable rigid modules over the cluster-tilted algebra correspond bijectively to the cluster variables outside the chosen cluster. Many people have studied cluster-tilted algebras in this context, see for example [12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22].

The second motivation came from classical tilting theory. Tilted algebras are the endomorphism algebras of tilting modules over hereditary algebras, whereas cluster-tilted algebras are the endomorphism algebras of cluster-tilting objects over cluster categories of hereditary algebras. This similarity in the two definitions lead to the following precise relation between tilted and cluster-tilted algebras, which was established in [3].

There is a surjective map

$$\{\text{tilted algebras}\} \mapsto \{\text{cluster-tilted algebras}\}$$

*The author was supported by the University of Connecticut

$$C \longmapsto B = C \ltimes E$$

where E denotes the C - C -bimodule $E = \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$ and $C \ltimes E$ is the trivial extension.

This result allows one to define cluster-tilted algebras without using the cluster category. It is natural to ask how the module categories of C and B are related and several results in this direction have been obtained, see for example [4, 5, 6, 11, 13]. In this work, we investigate the τ -rigidity of a C -module when the same module is viewed as a B -module via the standard embedding. We let M be a right C -module and define a right $B = C \ltimes E$ action on M by

$$M \times B \rightarrow M, \quad (m, (c, e)) \mapsto mc.$$

Our main result deals with C -modules that satisfy $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C M) = 0$ otherwise known as τ_C -rigid modules. We show the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a partial tilting C -module such that $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$. Then M is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$.*

In the special case where C is a tilted algebra and B is the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra, we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for an indecomposable τ_C -rigid module and a τ_C -tilting module to be τ_B -rigid.

Corollary 1.2. *Let C be a tilted algebra such that $C = \text{End}_A T$ where A is hereditary and T is a tilting A -module. Let $B = C \ltimes E$ be the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra and let M be an indecomposable τ_C -rigid module. Then M is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$.*

Proposition 1.3. *Let C be a tilted algebra such that $C = \text{End}_A T$ where A is hereditary and T is a tilting A -module. Let B be the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra. If M is τ_C -tilting, then M is τ_B -tilting if and only if $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$.*

2 Notation and Preliminaries

We now set the notation for the remainder of this paper. All algebras are assumed to be finite dimensional over an algebraically closed field k . Suppose $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ is a connected quiver without oriented cycles where Q_0 denotes a finite set of vertices and Q_1 denotes a finite set of oriented arrows. By kQ we denote the path algebra of Q . If Λ is a k -algebra then denote by $\text{mod } \Lambda$ the category of finitely generated right Λ -modules and by $\text{ind } \Lambda$ a set of representatives of each isomorphism class of indecomposable right Λ -modules. Given $M \in \text{mod } \Lambda$, the projective dimension of M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is denoted $\text{pd}_\Lambda M$ and its injective dimension by $\text{id}_\Lambda M$. We denote by $\text{add } M$ the smallest additive full subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ containing M , that is, the full subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ whose objects are the direct sums of direct summands of the module M . We let τ_Λ and τ_Λ^{-1} be the Auslander-Reiten translations in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. We let D be the standard duality functor $\text{Hom}_k(-, k)$. Also, ΩM and $\Omega^{-1} M$ will denote the first syzygy and first cosyzygy of M . Finally, let gl.dim stand for the global dimension of an algebra.

2.1 Tilted Algebras

Tilting theory is one of the main themes in the study of the representation theory of algebras. Given a k -algebra A , one can construct a new algebra B in such a way that the corresponding module categories are closely related. The main idea is that of a tilting module.

Definition 2.1. Let A be an algebra. An A -module T is a *partial tilting module* if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\text{pd}_A T \leq 1$.
- (2) $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, T) = 0$.

A partial tilting module T is called a *tilting module* if it also satisfies the following additional condition:

- (3) There exists a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T' \rightarrow T'' \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{mod } A$ with T' and $T'' \in \text{add } T$.

We recall that an A -module M is *faithful* if its right annihilator

$$\text{Ann } M = \{a \in A \mid Ma = 0\}.$$

vanishes. It follows easily from (3) that any tilting module is faithful. We will need the following characterization of faithful modules. Define $\text{Gen } M$ to be the class of all modules X in $\text{mod } A$ generated by M , that is, the modules X such that there exists an integer $d \geq 0$ and an epimorphism $M^d \rightarrow X$ of A -modules. Here, M^d is the direct sum of d copies of M . Dually, we define $\text{Cogen } M$ to be the class of all modules Y in $\text{mod } A$ cogenerated by M , that is, the modules Y such that there exist an integer $d \geq 0$ and a monomorphism $Y \rightarrow M^d$ of A -modules.

Lemma 2.2. [8, VI, Lemma 2.2.]. *Let A be an algebra and M an A -module. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) M is faithful.
- (c) A is cogenerated by M .
- (d) DA is generated by M .

Partial tilting modules induce torsion pairs in a natural way. We consider the restriction to a subcategory C of a functor F defined originally on a module category, and we denote it by $F|_C$. Also, let S be a subcategory of a category C . We say S is a *full subcategory* of C if, for each pair of objects X and Y of S , $\text{Hom}_S(X, Y) = \text{Hom}_C(X, Y)$.

Definition 2.3. A pair of full subcategories $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of $\text{mod } A$ is called a *torsion pair* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (a) $\text{Hom}_A(M, N) = 0$ for all $M \in \mathcal{T}, N \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (b) $\text{Hom}_A(M, -)|_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ implies $M \in \mathcal{T}$.

(c) $\text{Hom}_A(-, N)|_{\mathcal{T}} = 0$ implies $N \in \mathcal{F}$.

Consider the following full subcategories of $\text{mod } A$ where T is a partial tilting A -module.

$$\mathcal{T}(T) = \{M \in \text{mod } A \mid \text{Ext}_A^1(T, M) = 0\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(T) = \{M \in \text{mod } A \mid \text{Hom}_A(T, M) = 0\}$$

Then $(\mathcal{T}(T), \mathcal{F}(T))$ is a torsion pair in $\text{mod } A$ called the *induced torsion pair* of T . Considering the endomorphism algebra $C = \text{End}_A T$, there is an induced torsion pair, $(\mathcal{X}(T), \mathcal{Y}(T))$, in $\text{mod } C$.

$$\mathcal{X}(T) = \{M \in \text{mod } B \mid M \otimes_C T = 0\}$$

$$\mathcal{Y}(T) = \{M \in \text{mod } B \mid \text{Tor}_1^C(M, T) = 0\}$$

We now state the definition of a tilted algebra.

Definition 2.4. Let A be a hereditary algebra with T a tilting A -module. Then the algebra $C = \text{End}_A T$ is called a *tilted algebra*.

The following proposition describes several facts about tilted algebras. Let A be an algebra and M, N be two indecomposable A -modules. A *path* in $\text{mod } A$ from M to N is a sequence

$$M = M_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} M_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} M_2 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_s} M_s = N$$

where $s \geq 0$, all the M_i are indecomposable, and all the f_i are nonzero nonisomorphisms. In this case, M is called a *predecessor* of N in $\text{mod } A$ and N is called a *successor* of M in $\text{mod } A$.

Proposition 2.5. [8, VIII, Lemma 3.2.]. Let A be a hereditary algebra, T a tilting A -module, and $C = \text{End}_A T$ the corresponding tilted algebra. Then

- (a) $\text{gl.dim } C \leq 2$.
- (b) For all $M \in \text{ind } C$, $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$ or $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$.
- (c) For all $M \in \mathcal{X}(T)$, $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$.
- (d) For all $M \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$, $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$.
- (e) $(\mathcal{X}(T), \mathcal{Y}(T))$ is split, meaning every indecomposable C -module belongs to either $\mathcal{X}(T)$ or $\mathcal{Y}(T)$.
- (f) $\mathcal{Y}(T)$ is closed under predecessors and $\mathcal{X}(T)$ is closed under successors.

We also need the following characterization of split torsion pairs.

Proposition 2.6. [8, VI, Proposition 1.7] Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ be a torsion pair in $\text{mod } A$. The following are equivalent:

- (a) $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is split.
- (b) If $M \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\tau_A^{-1} M \in \mathcal{T}$.
- (c) If $N \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\tau_A N \in \mathcal{F}$.

2.2 Cluster categories and cluster-tilted algebras

Let $A = kQ$ and let $\mathcal{D}^b(\text{mod } A)$ denote the derived category of bounded complexes of A -modules as summarized in [14]. The *cluster category* C_A is defined as the orbit category of the derived category with respect to the functor $\tau_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}[1]$, where $\tau_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the Auslander-Reiten translation in the derived category and $[1]$ is the shift. Cluster categories were introduced in [14], and in [18] for type $\mathbb{A}$, and were further studied in [2, 21, 22, 23]. They are triangulated categories [21], that are 2-Calabi Yau and have Serre duality [14].

An object T in C_A is called *cluster-tilting* if $\text{Ext}_{C_A}^1(T, T) = 0$ and T has $|Q_0|$ non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands. The endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{C_A} T$ of a cluster-tilting object is called a *cluster-tilted algebra* [15].

Let C be an algebra of global dimension at most 2 and let E be the C - C -bimodule $E = \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$.

Definition 2.7. The *relation extension* of C is the trivial extension $B = C \ltimes E$, whose underlying C -module structure is $C \oplus E$, and multiplication is given by $(c, e)(c', e') = (cc', ce' + ec')$.

Relation extensions were introduced in [3]. In the special case where C is a tilted algebra, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.8. [3]. *Let C be a tilted algebra. Then $B = C \ltimes \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$ is a cluster-tilted algebra. Moreover all cluster-tilted algebras are of this form.*

2.3 Induction and coinduction functors

A fruitful way to study cluster-tilted algebras is via induction and coinduction functors. Recall, D denotes the standard duality functor.

Definition 2.9. Let C be a subalgebra of B such that $1_C = 1_B$, then

$$- \otimes_C B : \text{mod } C \rightarrow \text{mod } B$$

is called the *induction functor*, and dually

$$D(B \otimes_C D-) : \text{mod } C \rightarrow \text{mod } B$$

is called the *coinduction functor*. Moreover, given $M \in \text{mod } C$, the corresponding induced module is defined to be $M \otimes_C B$, and the coinduced module is defined to be $D(B \otimes_C DM)$.

We can say more in the situation when B is a split extension of C . Call a C - C -bimodule E *nilpotent* if, for $n \geq 0$, $E \otimes_C E \otimes_C \cdots \otimes_C E = 0$, where the tensor product is performed n times.

Definition 2.10. Let B and C be two algebras. We say B is a *split extension* of C by a nilpotent bimodule E if there exists a short exact sequence of B -modules

$$0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow B \begin{smallmatrix} \xrightarrow{\pi} \\ \xleftarrow{\sigma} \end{smallmatrix} C \rightarrow 0$$

where π and σ are algebra morphisms, such that $\pi \circ \sigma = 1_C$, and $E = \ker \pi$ is nilpotent.

In particular, relation extensions are split extensions. The next proposition shows a precise relationship between a given C -module and its image under the induction and coinduction functors.

Proposition 2.11. [24, Proposition 3.6]. *Suppose B is a split extension of C by a nilpotent bi-module E . Then, for every $M \in \text{mod } C$, there exists two short exact sequences of B -modules:*

- (a) $0 \rightarrow M \otimes_C E \rightarrow M \otimes_C B \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$
- (b) $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow D(B \otimes_C DM) \rightarrow D(E \otimes_C DM) \rightarrow 0$

2.4 Induced and coinduced modules in cluster-tilted algebras

In this section we cite several properties of the induction and coinduction functors particularly when C is an algebra of global dimension at most 2 and $B = C \ltimes E$ is the trivial extension of C by the C - C -bimodule $E = \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$. In the specific case when C is also a tilted algebra, B is the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra.

Proposition 2.12. [24, Proposition 4.1]. *Let C be an algebra of global dimension at most 2. Then*

- (a) $E \cong \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} C$.
- (b) $DE \cong \tau_C \Omega_C DC$.
- (c) $M \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M$.
- (d) $D(E \otimes_C DM) \cong \tau_C \Omega_C M$.

The next two results use homological dimensions to extract information about induced and coinduced modules.

Proposition 2.13. [24, Proposition 4.2]. *Let C be an algebra of global dimension at most 2, and let $B = C \ltimes E$. Suppose $M \in \text{mod } C$, then*

- (a) $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$ if and only if $M \otimes_C B \cong M$.
- (b) $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$ if and only if $D(B \otimes_C DM) \cong M$.

The following lemma is used extensively.

Lemma 2.14. *Let C be an algebra of global dimension equal to 2 and let M be a C -module. Then,*

- (a) $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} C, M) = 0$.
- (b) $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C \Omega_C DC) = 0$.

Proof. We prove (a) with the proof of (b) being similar. Assume $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C \rightarrow I_0 \rightarrow \Omega_C^{-1}C \rightarrow 0$$

where I_0 is an injective envelope of C . Apply $\text{Hom}_C(M, -)$ to obtain an exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}_C^1(M, I_0) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_C^2(M, C).$$

Now, $\text{Ext}_C^1(M, I_0) = 0$ because I_0 is injective and $\text{Ext}_C^2(M, C) = 0$ because $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$. Since the sequence is exact, $\text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C) = 0$. By the Auslander-Reiten formulas, $D\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C, M) \cong \text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C)$. Thus, we have

$$0 = \text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C) \cong D\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C, M).$$

Conversely, assume $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C, M) = 0$. Then we have

$$D\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C, M) \cong \text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C) = 0$$

by the Auslander-Reiten formulas. We then have $\text{Ext}_C^2(M, C) \cong \text{Ext}_C^1(M, \Omega_C^{-1}C) = 0$. Since C has global dimension equal to 2, this implies $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$. $\square$

The following corollary will be used in section 3.2.

Corollary 2.15. *Suppose that $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$. Then $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, M) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $f : P \rightarrow M$ be a projective cover of M in $\text{mod } C$. Apply the functor $- \otimes_C E$ to obtain a surjective morphism $f \otimes_C 1_E : P \otimes_C E \rightarrow M \otimes_C E$. Apply $\text{Hom}_C(-, M)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(M \otimes_C E, M) \xrightarrow{\overline{f \otimes_C 1_E}} \text{Hom}_C(P \otimes_C E, M).$$

Now, Proposition 2.12 says $M \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M$ and $P \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P$. Thus, we have that $\text{Hom}_C(P \otimes_C E, M) = 0$ by Lemma 2.14 and conclude $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, M) = 0$. $\square$

The following main result from [25] is needed.

Theorem 2.16. *Let M be a rigid C -module with a projective cover $P_0 \rightarrow M$ and an injective envelope $M \rightarrow I_0$ in $\text{mod } C$.*

- (a) *If $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega^{-1}P_0, M) = 0$, then M is a rigid B -module.*
- (b) *If $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C\Omega I_0) = 0$, then M is a rigid B -module.*

2.5 τ -rigid modules

Following [1] we state the following definition.

Definition 2.17. A Λ -module M is τ_Λ -rigid if $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \tau_\Lambda M) = 0$. A τ_Λ -rigid module M is τ_Λ -tilting if the number of pairwise, non-isomorphic, indecomposable summands of M equals the number of isomorphism classes of simple Λ -modules.

It follows from the Auslander-Reiten formulas that any τ_Λ -rigid module is rigid and the converse holds if the projective dimension is at most 1. In particular, any partial tilting module is a τ_Λ -rigid module, and any tilting module is a τ_Λ -tilting module. Thus, we can regard τ_Λ -tilting theory as a generalization of classic tilting theory.

The following theorem provides a characterization of τ_Λ -rigid modules.

Proposition 2.18. [10, Proposition 5.8]. *For X and Y in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, \tau_\Lambda Y) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(Y, \text{Gen } X) = 0$.*

The following observations are useful.

Proposition 2.19. [1, Proposition 2.4]. *Let X be in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ with a minimal projective presentation $P_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} X \rightarrow 0$.*

(a) *For Y in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, we have an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda(Y, \tau_\Lambda X) \rightarrow D\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1, Y) \xrightarrow{D(d_1, Y)} D\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0, Y) \xrightarrow{D(d_0, Y)} D\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, Y) \rightarrow 0.$$

(b) *$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(Y, \tau_\Lambda X) = 0$ if and only if the morphism $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0, Y) \xrightarrow{(d_1, Y)} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1, Y)$ is surjective.*

(c) *X is τ_Λ -rigid if and only if the morphism $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0, X) \xrightarrow{(d_1, X)} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1, X)$ is surjective.*

The following lemma is very useful in applications. We need several preliminary definitions. Let U be a Λ -module. We define

$${}^\perp(\tau_\Lambda U) = \{X \in \text{mod } \Lambda \mid \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, \tau_\Lambda U) = 0\}.$$

Also, we say a module $X \in \text{Gen } U$ is *Ext-projective* if $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(X, \text{Gen } U) = 0$. We denote by $P(\text{Gen } U)$ the direct sum of one copy of each indecomposable Ext-projective module in $\text{Gen } U$ up to isomorphism. Finally, we say a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a *left Gen M -approximation* if $B \in \text{Gen } M$ and, whenever $g: A \rightarrow C$ is a morphism with $C \in \text{Gen } M$, there is some $h: B \rightarrow C$ such that $h \circ f = g$.

Lemma 2.20. [1, Lemma 2.20]. *Let T be a τ_Λ -rigid module. If U is a τ_Λ -rigid module satisfying ${}^\perp(\tau_\Lambda T) \subseteq {}^\perp(\tau_\Lambda U)$, then there is an exact sequence*

$$U \xrightarrow{f} T' \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$$

satisfying the following conditions.

- *f is a minimal left Gen T -approximation of U .*
- *T' is in $\text{add } T$, C is in $\text{add } P(\text{Gen } T)$, and $\text{add } T' \cap \text{add } C = 0$.*

We will also need the following special case of Lemma 2.20.

Lemma 2.21. [1, Proposition 2.23]. *Let T be a τ_Λ -tilting module. Assume that U is a τ_Λ -rigid module such that $\text{Gen } T \subseteq {}^\perp(\tau_\Lambda U)$. Then there exists an exact sequence*

$$U \xrightarrow{f} T^0 \rightarrow T^1 \rightarrow 0$$

such that

- f is a minimal left $\text{Gen } T$ -approximation of U .
- T^0 and T^1 are in $\text{add } T$ and satisfy $\text{add } T^0 \cap \text{add } T^1 = 0$.

We now return to the situation where the algebra B is a split extension of the algebra C by a nilpotent bimodule E . The induction functor can be used to derive information about the Auslander-Reiten translation of a C -module M inside the module category of B . The next theorem tells us exactly when the Auslander-Reiten translation remains the same, i.e., $\tau_C M \cong \tau_B M$ as B -modules.

Theorem 2.22. [9, Theorem 2.1]. *Let M be an indecomposable non-projective C -module. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The almost split sequences ending with M in $\text{mod } C$ and $\text{mod } B$ coincide.*
- (b) $\tau_C M \cong \tau_B M$.
- (c) $\text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M) = 0$ and $M \otimes_C E = 0$.

Having information about the Auslander-Reiten translation of an induced module is very useful.

Lemma 2.23. [7, Lemma 2.1]. *Let M be a C -module. Then*

$$\tau_B(M \otimes_C B) \cong \text{Hom}_C({}_B B_C, \tau_C M) \cong \tau_C M \oplus \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)$$

where the isomorphisms are isomorphisms of C -modules.

Deducing information about $\tau_B M$ is generally more difficult but we have an answer in the following special case.

Lemma 2.24. [9, Corollary 1.3]. *Assume $M \otimes_C E = 0$, then we have*

$$\tau_B M \cong \tau_C M \oplus \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)$$

where the isomorphism is an isomorphism of C -modules.

We also have the following important fact which will be used extensively.

Lemma 2.25. [9, Corollary 1.2]. $\tau_C M$ and $\tau_B(M \otimes_C B)$ are submodules of $\tau_B M$.

Finally, we note the following lemma.

Lemma 2.26. [25, Lemma 4.1] *Let M be a C -module with $f : P_0 \rightarrow M$ a projective cover in $\text{mod } C$. Suppose $g : P_0 \otimes_C B \rightarrow P_0$ is a projective cover of P_0 in $\text{mod } B$. Then $f \circ g : P_0 \otimes_C B \rightarrow M$ is a projective cover of M in $\text{mod } B$.*

3 Main Results

We assume C is an algebra of global dimension 2 and $B = C \ltimes E$ where $E = \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$. Specific cases will be explicitly stated. We wish to use various homological dimensions to derive information about the τ_B -rigidity of a C -module. We begin with determining when the Auslander-Reiten translation of a C -module remains unchanged in $\text{mod } C$ and $\text{mod } B$, i.e., when is $\tau_C M \cong \tau_B M$ as B -modules.

3.1 Homological Dimensions and τ_B -rigidity

Proposition 3.1. *Let M be a C -module. Then $\tau_C M \cong \tau_B M$ if and only if $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$ and $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$*

Proof. By Theorem 2.22, we know $\tau_C M \cong \tau_B M$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M) = 0$ and $M \otimes_C E = 0$. Using Lemma 2.14, we know that $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} C, \tau_C M) = 0$. Since Proposition 2.12 gives $E \cong \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} C$, this is equivalent to $\text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M) = 0$. Using Proposition 2.13, we have $M \otimes_C E = 0$ if and only if $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$. Our result follows. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Let M be a τ_C -rigid C -module. If $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. Since $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$, Proposition 2.13 implies $M \otimes_C E = 0$. By Lemma 2.24, we have $\tau_B M \cong \tau_C M \oplus \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)$ as C -modules. Now, we want to show that $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B M) = 0$. Since any B -module homomorphism is also a C -module homomorphism, it suffices to show that $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C M)$ and $\text{Hom}_C(M, \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M))$ are equal to 0. Now, $\text{Hom}_C(M, \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)) \cong \text{Hom}_C(M \otimes_C E, \tau_C M)$ by the adjoint isomorphism. Since $M \otimes_C E = 0$, we conclude $\text{Hom}_C(M, \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)) = 0$. Certainly, M being τ_C -rigid implies $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C M) = 0$. Thus, we conclude M is τ_B -rigid. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *Let M be a τ_C -rigid C -module. If $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$, then the induced module $M \otimes_C B$ is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. Consider the following short exact sequence guaranteed by Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.12.

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M \rightarrow M \otimes_C B \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0.$$

Apply $\text{Hom}_B(-, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B))$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)). \quad (1)$$

We wish to show that $\text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) = 0$. Using Lemma 2.23, we know that $\tau_B(M \otimes_C B) \cong \tau_C M \oplus \text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M)$ as C -modules. Since $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$, Lemma 2.14 implies $\text{Hom}_C(E, \tau_C M) = 0$. Thus, $\tau_B(M \otimes_C B) \cong \tau_C M$. Since M is a τ_C -rigid module, we have that $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) = 0$.

Next, consider $f: P_0 \rightarrow M$, a projective cover of M in $\text{mod } C$. Apply the functor $-\otimes_C E$ to obtain a surjective morphism $f \otimes_C 1_E: P_0 \otimes_C E \rightarrow M \otimes_C E$. This gives a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker f \otimes_C 1_E \rightarrow P_0 \otimes_C E \xrightarrow{f \otimes_C 1_E} M \otimes_C E \rightarrow 0.$$

Apply $\text{Hom}_C(-, \tau_C M)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(M \otimes_C E, \tau_C M) \xrightarrow{\overline{f \otimes_C 1_E}} \text{Hom}_C(P_0 \otimes_C E, \tau_C M).$$

We know from Proposition 2.12 that $P_0 \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} P_0$ and $M \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M$. Thus, any non-zero morphism from $\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M$ to $\tau_C M$ would imply a non-zero morphism from $\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} P_0$ to $\tau_C M$ because $\overline{f \otimes_C 1_E}$ is injective. Since $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$, this is a contradiction by Lemma 2.14. Thus, $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) = 0$. Since we have shown that $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B))$ and $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B))$ are equal to 0, we conclude $\text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \tau_B(M \otimes_C B)) = 0$ by sequence (1). $\square$

3.2 Partial Tilting Modules and τ_B -rigidity

As in section 3.1, we assume C is an algebra of global dimension 2 and let $B = C \ltimes E$ where $E = \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$. The next three results deal with C -modules M which are partial tilting modules. Our main result gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a partial tilting module to remain τ_B -rigid in the special case where $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let M be a partial tilting C -module such that $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$. Then M is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. Consider the following short exact sequence guaranteed by Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.12

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M \xrightarrow{h} M \otimes_C B \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

Apply $\text{Hom}_B(-, \text{Gen } M)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(M \otimes_C B, \text{Gen } M).$$

Since $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$, we know from Proposition 3.3 that $M \otimes_C B$ is a τ_B -rigid module. Since $\text{Gen } M \subseteq \text{Gen}(M \otimes_C B)$, Proposition 2.18 implies that $\text{Ext}_B^1(M \otimes_C B, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. Also, $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ which implies $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. Thus, sequence (1) yields $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$, and Proposition 2.18 implies M is τ_B -rigid.

Assume M is τ_B -rigid. Again, because $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$, we know $M \otimes_C B$ is a τ_B -rigid module by Proposition 3.3. Since $M \otimes_C B$ is τ_B -rigid and $\tau_B(M \otimes_C B)$ is a submodule of $\tau_B M$ by Lemma 2.25, we have ${}^\perp(\tau_B M) \subseteq {}^\perp(\tau_B(M \otimes_C B))$. Thus, Lemma 2.20 guarantees an exact sequence

$$M \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{f} M' \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$$

where $M' \in \text{add } M$ and $C \in \text{add } P(\text{Gen } M)$. Next, consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker g \xrightarrow{i} M' \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0.$$

We know that $f : M \otimes_C B \rightarrow \ker g$ is a surjective morphism. Considering f as a morphism of C -modules, we have a surjective morphism $f : M \oplus \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M \rightarrow \ker g$ where

the following decomposition $M \otimes_C B \cong M \oplus \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M$ is given by Proposition 2.12. Now, consider the Hom space $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \ker g)$. If this Hom space were not equal to 0, then the injectivity of i would imply a non-zero morphism from $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M$ to M' . But M' is partial tilting and we would have a contradiction to Corollary 2.15. But we can not have a surjective morphism from M to $\ker g$ because this would imply $\ker g \in \text{Gen } M$ and would contradict $C \in \text{add } P(\text{Gen } M)$. Thus, $C = 0$ and we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker f \rightarrow M \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{f} M' \rightarrow 0.$$

Apply $\text{Hom}_B(-, \text{Gen } M)$ to obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(M', \text{Gen } M) \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(\ker f, \text{Gen } M).$$

Now, Lemma 2.20 says that f is a left $\text{Gen } M$ -approximation of $M \otimes_C B$. This implies that $\bar{f}$ is surjective and the exactness of the sequence further implies $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism. Returning to sequence (1), we apply $\text{Hom}_B(-, \text{Gen } M)$ to obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(M, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \text{Gen } M) \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} \text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow 0$$

where $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ by Proposition 2.18. Since $\bar{h}$ is a surjective morphism, given $a \in \text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M)$, there exists $b \in \text{Hom}_B(M \otimes_C B, \text{Gen } M)$ such that $a = b \circ h$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M & \xrightarrow{h} & M \otimes_C B \\ a = b \circ h \downarrow & \swarrow b & \\ \text{Gen } M & & \end{array}$$

Since we have a morphism b from $M \otimes_C B$ to a module in $\text{Gen } M$, we may use $\bar{f}$ to say there exists a morphism $c \in \text{Hom}_B(M', \text{Gen } M)$ such that $b = c \circ f$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes_C B & \xrightarrow{f} & M' \\ b = c \circ f \downarrow & \swarrow c & \\ \text{Gen } M & & \end{array}$$

So we have $a = b \circ h = c \circ f \circ h$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M & \xrightarrow{h} & M \otimes_C B & \xrightarrow{f} & M' \\ a = c \circ f \circ h \downarrow & & & \swarrow c & \\ \text{Gen } M & & & & \end{array}$$

But $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, M') = 0$ by Lemma 2.14 and a must be the 0 morphism. Since a was arbitrary, we conclude $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ and our result follows. $\square$

For an illustration of this theorem, see Examples 5.1 and 5.2 in section 5.

In the special case where C is a tilted algebra and B is the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra, we have a complete classification determining when an indecomposable τ_C -rigid module is also τ_B -rigid.

Corollary 3.5. *Let C be a tilted algebra such that $C = \text{End}_A T$ where A is hereditary and T is a tilting A -module. Let B be the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra and let M be an indecomposable τ_C -rigid module. Then M is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$.*

Proof. Since M is indecomposable and C is tilted, we know from Proposition 2.5 that $M \in \mathcal{X}(T)$ or $M \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$. Assume $M \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$. Since $(\mathcal{Y}(T), \mathcal{X}(T))$ is split, we know $\tau_C M \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$ by Proposition 2.6. Also, by Proposition 2.5, $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$ and $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M \leq 1$. Since M is τ_C -rigid by assumption, we have M is a partial tilting module. Our result follows from Theorem 3.4.

Next, assume $M \in \mathcal{X}(T)$. Then Proposition 2.5 says $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$. Thus, $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M = 0$ and certainly $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. Also, Proposition 3.2 says M is τ_B -rigid. Our result follows. $\square$

The case where M is a tilting C -module follows from the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Let M be a τ_C -rigid module which is faithful. Then M is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$, then M is τ_B -rigid by Proposition 3.2. Conversely, assume M is τ_B -rigid and suppose $\text{id}_C M = 2$. Then Lemma 2.14 implies $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C\Omega_C(DC)) \neq 0$. Consider the following short exact sequence in $\text{mod } B$ guaranteed by Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.12

$$0 \rightarrow DC \rightarrow DB \xrightarrow{f} \tau_C\Omega_C(DC) \rightarrow 0.$$

Apply $\text{Hom}_B(M, -)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_B(M, DB) \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_C\Omega_C(DC)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(M, DC) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(M, DB).$$

Now, $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, DB) = 0$ because DB is an injective B -module. Also, because M is a faithful C -module, Lemma 2.2 tells us that DC is generated by M . Thus, because M is τ_B -rigid, we know $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, DC) = 0$ by Proposition 2.18. This implies that $\bar{f}$ is a surjective morphism. Thus, given any morphism $g \in \text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_C\Omega_C(DC))$, there exists a morphism $h \in \text{Hom}_B(M, DB)$ such that $g = \bar{f} \circ h$.

Next, consider an injective envelope $j: M \rightarrow I_0$ of M in $\text{mod } C$. Now, I_0 may or may not be an injective B -module but j is still an injective map in $\text{mod } B$. Since DB is an injective B -module, there exists a morphism $k: I_0 \rightarrow DB$ such that $h = k \circ j$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{j} & I_0 \\ & & \downarrow h & \swarrow k & \\ & & DB & & \end{array}$$

Thus, we have $g = f \circ h = f \circ k \circ j$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{g} & \tau_C \Omega_C(DC) \\ \downarrow j & \nearrow f \circ k & \\ I_0 & & \end{array}$$

But I_0 is an injective C -module and Lemma 2.14 implies $\text{Hom}_C(I_0, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) = 0$ and subsequently $\text{Hom}_B(I_0, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) = 0$. This forces $g = f \circ k \circ j = 0$. Since g was an arbitrary morphism, we conclude $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) = 0$. But we showed $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) \neq 0$, which implies $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) \neq 0$, and we have a contradiction. Thus, the assumption $\text{id}_C M = 2$ must be false, and we conclude $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$. $\square$

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose M is a tilting C -module. Then M is τ_B -tilting if and only if $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since M is a tilting C -module, it is faithful by Lemma 2.2, and our result follows from Proposition 3.6. $\square$

For an illustration of this corollary, see Examples 5.3 and 5.4 in section 5.

We may generalize the preceding result in the special case that the algebra C is tilted.

Proposition 3.8. *Let C be a tilted algebra such that $C = \text{End}_A T$ where A is hereditary and T is a tilting A -module. Let B be the corresponding cluster-tilted algebra. If M is τ_C -tilting, then M is τ_B -tilting if and only if $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$.*

Proof. Assume $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$. Since M is τ_C -rigid, we know from Proposition 3.2 that M is also τ_B -rigid. Next, assume M is τ_B -tilting and suppose $\text{id}_C M = 2$. Then at least one indecomposable summand of M , say M_i , has injective dimension equal to 2 in $\text{mod } C$. By Proposition 2.5, we know $M_i \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$. By Proposition 2.6, we know $(\mathcal{Y}(T), \mathcal{X}(T))$ is split which implies $\tau_C M_i \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$ and Proposition 2.5 gives $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M_i \leq 1$. Thus, by Proposition 3.3, we have that $M_i \otimes_C B$ is τ_B -rigid.

By Lemma 2.25, we know $\tau_B(M_i \otimes_C B)$ is a submodule of $\tau_B M_i$. Thus, we have $\text{Gen } M \subseteq {}^\perp(\tau_B(M_i \otimes_C B))$. By Lemma 2.21, there exists an exact sequence

$$M_i \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{f} M^0 \xrightarrow{g} M^1 \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

where f is a minimal left $\text{Gen } M$ -approximation of $M_i \otimes_C B$, M^0 and M^1 are in $\text{add } M$, and we have $\text{add } M^0 \cap \text{add } M^1 = 0$. Next, consider the following short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker g \rightarrow M^0 \xrightarrow{g} M^1 \rightarrow 0. \quad (2)$$

We have a surjective morphism $f : M_i \otimes_C B \rightarrow \ker g$. Using Proposition 2.12, we have a surjective morphism $f : M_i \oplus \tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M \rightarrow \ker g$ in $\text{mod } C$. Now, we must have $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} M_i, \ker g) \neq 0$ for every indecomposable summand of $\ker g$. Otherwise,

we would have a surjective morphism from M_i to a summand of $\ker g$ say $\ker g_j$. This would imply $\ker g_j \in \text{Gen } M_i$. Thus, (2) would imply $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M_i) \neq 0$ unless (2) splits. But (2) can not split because Lemma 2.21 states $\text{add } M^0 \cap \text{add } M^1 = 0$. Thus, $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M_i) \neq 0$ would give a contradiction to Proposition 2.18.

Since $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M_i, \ker g) \neq 0$ for every summand of $\ker g$, Corollary 2.15 says that $\text{pd}_C(\ker g) = 2$ for every summand of $\ker g$. Since C is a tilted algebra, Proposition 2.5 says $\ker g \in \mathcal{X}(T)$. Returning to (1), we know f is a left $\text{Gen } M$ -approximation of $M_i \otimes_C B$. Thus, given any non-zero morphism $h : M_i \otimes_C B \rightarrow M_i$, there exists a morphism $j : M^0 \rightarrow M_i$ such that $h = j \circ f$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & M_i \otimes_C B & \\ f \swarrow & \downarrow h = j \circ f & \\ M^0 & \xrightarrow{j} & M_i \end{array}$$

But f must factor through $\ker g$ which implies a non-zero morphism from $\ker g$ to M_i . Since $\ker g \in \mathcal{X}(T)$ and $M_i \in \mathcal{Y}(T)$, we have a contradiction by Proposition 2.5. Thus, we have $\text{Hom}_B(M_i \otimes_C B, M_i) = 0$ but this is a contradiction by Proposition 2.11. So $\text{id}_C M_i \leq 1$ and, since M_i was arbitrary, we conclude $\text{id}_C M \leq 1$. $\square$

4 Projective Covers and τ_B -rigidity

In this section, we wish to use a module's projective cover to determine whether a C -module is τ_B -rigid. We begin with projective C -modules. We derive a necessary and sufficient condition for a projective C -module to be τ_B -rigid.

Proposition 4.1. *Let P be a projective C -module with $\bar{P}$ a projective cover of $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P$ in $\text{mod } C$. Then P is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P) = 0$.*

Proof. In $\text{mod } B$, consider the following short exact sequence guaranteed by Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.12

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P \xrightarrow{f} P \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\bar{P} \otimes_C B$ is a projective cover of $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P$ in $\text{mod } B$ by Lemma 2.26, we have a minimal projective presentation

$$\bar{P} \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{h} P \otimes_C B \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0.$$

By Proposition 2.19, P is τ_B -rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_B(P \otimes_C B, P) \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} \text{Hom}_B(\bar{P} \otimes_C B, P)$ is surjective. Assume $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P) = 0$. Considering $\bar{P} \otimes_C B$ as a C -module, we know $\bar{P} \otimes_C B \cong (\bar{P} \otimes_C C) \oplus (\bar{P} \otimes_C E)$. Now, $\bar{P} \otimes_C C \cong \bar{P}$ and Proposition 2.12 implies that $\bar{P} \otimes_C E \cong \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}\bar{P}$. We have $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P) = 0$ by assumption and $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}\bar{P}, P) = 0$ by Lemma 2.14. Thus, $\text{Hom}_B(\bar{P} \otimes_C B, P) = 0$ and clearly $\bar{h}$ will be surjective. We conclude P is τ_B -rigid.

Conversely, assume P is τ_B -rigid. Then $\bar{h}$ must be a surjective morphism, i.e., given any morphism $j \in \text{Hom}_B(\bar{P} \otimes_C B, P)$, there exists a morphism $k \in \text{Hom}_B(P \otimes_C B, P)$ such that $j = k \circ h$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \bar{P} \otimes_C B & \\ h \swarrow & \downarrow j = k \circ h & \\ P \otimes_C B & \xrightarrow{k} & P \end{array}$$

But h must factor through $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P$, and $\text{Hom}_B(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P, P) = 0$ by Lemma 2.14. This implies that j must be the 0 morphism, and thus $\text{Hom}_B(\bar{P} \otimes_C B, P) = 0$. Since $\bar{P} \otimes_C B$ is the projective cover of $\bar{P}$, we must have $\text{Hom}_B(\bar{P}, P) = 0$. By restriction of scalars, $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P) = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 4.2. *Let M be a τ_C -rigid module with $f : P_0 \rightarrow M$ a projective cover in $\text{mod } C$. If $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, \text{Gen } M) = 0$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. We modify the proof of Theorem 2.16 by replacing $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, M) = 0$ with the assumption $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. The concluding statement is now $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ and we conclude by Proposition 2.18 that M is τ_B -rigid. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *If M is τ_C -rigid, and $\text{pd}_C X \leq 1$ for every module $X \in \text{Gen } M$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. Since $\text{pd}_C X \leq 1$ for every module $X \in \text{Gen } M$, $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ by Lemma 2.14. Our result follows from Proposition 4.2. $\square$

Corollary 4.4. *Let M be τ_C -rigid with $f : P_0 \rightarrow M$ a projective cover in $\text{mod } C$. If P_0 is τ_B -rigid, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. Consider $g : \bar{P} \rightarrow \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0$ a projective cover in $\text{mod } C$. Since P_0 is τ_B -rigid by assumption, we know $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P_0) = 0$ by Proposition 4.1. Suppose there exists a morphism $h : \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0 \rightarrow X$ with $X \in \text{Gen } M$. This also gives a morphism $h \circ g : \bar{P} \rightarrow X$ because $\bar{P}$ is a projective C -module. Since $X \in \text{Gen } M$, we have a surjective morphism $k : M^d \rightarrow X$. Combining with the fact P_0 is a projective cover of M , we have a surjective morphism $k \circ f^d : P_0^d \rightarrow X$. However, since $\bar{P}$ is a projective C -module, we have an induced morphism $j : \bar{P} \rightarrow P_0^d$ such that $h \circ g = k \circ f^d \circ j$ and the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \bar{P} & & \\ & & \downarrow g & & \\ & & \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0 & & \\ j \swarrow & & \downarrow h & & \\ P_0^d & \xrightarrow{f^d} & M^d & \xrightarrow{k} & X \end{array}$$

But $\text{Hom}_C(\bar{P}, P_0) = 0$ and j must be the 0 morphism. If g is non-zero then we must have that h is also the 0 morphism. Since h was arbitrary, we conclude $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, X) = 0$ and Proposition 4.2 implies M is τ_B -rigid. $\square$

We have the following corollary in the special case that M is partial tilting and the projective dimension of $\tau_C M$ is not necessarily less than or equal to 1.

Corollary 4.5. *Let M be a partial tilting C -module with $f: P_0 \rightarrow M$ a projective cover in $\text{mod } C$. If $\text{Hom}_C(\Omega_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0), M) = 0$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

Proof. Consider the following short exact sequence in $\text{mod } C$

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_C^1(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0) \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow \tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0 \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

where P_1 is a projective cover of $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0$. Apply $\text{Hom}_C(-, M)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(P_1, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(\Omega_C^1(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0), M).$$

Since M is a partial tilting module we know $\text{pd}_C M \leq 1$. Thus, $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, M) = 0$ by Lemma 2.14. Also, $\text{Hom}_C(\Omega_C^1(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0), M) = 0$ by assumption. Since the sequence is exact, we have $\text{Hom}_C(P_1, M) = 0$. Since P_1 is a projective C -module, this further implies that $\text{Hom}_C(P_1, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. Apply $\text{Hom}_C(-, \text{Gen } M)$ to sequence (1) to obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, \text{Gen } M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(P_1, \text{Gen } M).$$

Since $\text{Hom}_C(P_1, \text{Gen } M) = 0$ and the sequence is exact, $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, \text{Gen } M) = 0$. By Proposition 4.2, we have that M is τ_B -rigid. $\square$

Next, we examine the special case where M is a semisimple C -module. We recall that a module M is *semisimple* if it is a direct sum of simple modules.

Proposition 4.6. *Let M be a τ_C -rigid semisimple C -module. Consider $f: P_0 \rightarrow M$ a projective cover and $g: M \rightarrow I_0$ an injective envelope in $\text{mod } C$.*

(a) *If $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, M) = 0$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*

(b) *If $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C\Omega_C I_0) = 0$, then M is τ_B -rigid.*


Proof. We prove (a) with the proof of (b) being dual. By assumption, we have M is τ_C -rigid and $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}P_0, M) = 0$. Thus, we know from Theorem 2.16 that M is a rigid B -module. Since M is semisimple, we have that $\text{Gen } M = \text{add } M$. Thus, we have

$$\text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{Gen } M) = \text{Ext}_B^1(M, \text{add } M) = \text{Ext}_B^1(M, M) = 0.$$


By Proposition 2.18, we conclude M is τ_B -rigid. $\square$

5 Examples

In this section we illustrate our main results with several examples. We will use the following throughout this section. Let A be the path algebra of the following quiver:



Since A is a hereditary algebra, we may construct a tilted algebra. To do this, we need an A -module which is tilting. Consider the Auslander-Reiten quiver of A which is given by:




Let T be the tilting A -module

$$T = 5 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 1$$

The corresponding tilted algebra $C = \text{End}_A T$ is given by the bound quiver

$$1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} 2 \xrightarrow{\beta} 3 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 4 \longrightarrow 5 \quad \alpha\beta\gamma = 0$$

Then, the Auslander-Reiten quiver of C is given by:




The corresponding cluster-tilted algebra $B = C \rtimes \text{Ext}_C^2(DC, C)$ is given by the bound quiver

$$1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} 2 \xrightarrow{\beta} 3 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 4 \longrightarrow 5 \quad \alpha\beta\gamma = \beta\gamma\delta = \gamma\delta\alpha = \delta\alpha\beta = 0$$

δ

Then, the Auslander-Reiten quiver of B is given by:



We will use Lemma 2.14 frequently so we note that

$$\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 1, \quad \tau_C\Omega_C(DC) = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 4.$$

We will illustrate Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.7. We will start with Theorem 3.4.

Example 5.1. Consider the C -module $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$. Then M is partial tilting, $\text{pd}_C \tau_C M = 0$, and $\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M = 1$. Since $1 \in \text{Gen } M$, we have $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1}\Omega_C^{-1}M, \text{Gen } M) \neq 0$. Note that $\tau_B M = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 1 \\ 5 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B M) \neq 0$ in accordance with Theorem 3.4.

Example 5.2. Consider the C -module $N = \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 4$. Then N is partial tilting, $\text{pd}_C \tau_C N = 0$, and $\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} N = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 1$. It is easily seen that $\text{Hom}_C(\tau_C^{-1} \Omega_C^{-1} N, \text{Gen } N) = 0$. We note that $\tau_B N = \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 44 \\ 15 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 15 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 4$ and $\text{Hom}_B(N, \tau_B N) = 0$ in accordance with Theorem 3.4.

The next two examples will illustrate Corollary 3.7.

Example 5.3. Consider the tilting C -module

$$M = 4 \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 4 \\ 5 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{smallmatrix}.$$

Recall that $\tau_C \Omega_C(DC) = \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 4$. Since $\text{Hom}_C(M, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) \neq 0$, Lemma 2.14 says $\text{id}_C M = 2$. Note that $\tau_B M = 1 \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 15 \end{smallmatrix}$ and we have $\text{Hom}_B(M, \tau_B M) \neq 0$ in accordance with Corollary 3.7.

Example 5.4. Consider the tilting C -module

$$T = 2 \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{smallmatrix}.$$

Since $\text{Hom}_C(T, \tau_C \Omega_C(DC)) = 0$, Lemma 2.14 says $\text{id}_C T \leq 1$. We note that

$$\tau_C T \cong \tau_B T = 3 \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{smallmatrix}$$

and $\text{Hom}_B(T, \tau_B T) = 0$ in accordance with Corollary 3.7.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges support from the University of Connecticut and would like to thank Ralf Schiffler for his guidance and helpful comments.

References

- [1] T. Adachi, O. Iyama and I. Reiten, τ -tilting theory, *Compos. Math.* **150** (2014), no. 3, 415–452.
- [2] C. Amoit, Cluster categories for algebras of global dimension 2 and quivers with potential, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **59**, (2009), no. 6, 2525–2590.

- [3] I. Assem, T. Brüstle and R. Schiffler, Cluster-tilted algebras as trivial extensions, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **40** (2008), 151–162.
- [4] I. Assem, T. Brüstle and R. Schiffler, Cluster-tilted algebras and slices, *J. of Algebra* **319** (2008), 3464–3479.
- [5] I. Assem, T. Brüstle and R. Schiffler, On the Galois covering of a cluster-tilted algebra, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **213** (7) (2009), 1450–1463.
- [6] I. Assem, T. Brüstle and R. Schiffler, Cluster-tilted algebras without clusters *J. Algebra* **324**, (2010), 2475–2502.
- [7] I. Assem and N. Marmaridis, Tilting modules and split-by-nilpotent extensions, *Comm. Algebra* **26** (1998), 1547–1555.
- [8] I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowronski, *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras, 1: Techniques of Representation Theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts 65, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [9] I. Assem and D. Zacharia, Full embeddings of almost split sequences over split-by-nilpotent extensions, *Coll. Math.* **81**, (1) (1999), 21–31.
- [10] M. Auslander and S. O. Smalø, Almost split sequences in subcategories, *J. Algebra* **69** (1981), no. 2, 426–454.
- [11] M. Barot, E. Fernandez, I. Prati, M. I. Platzeck and S. Trepode, From iterated tilted to cluster-tilted algebras, *Adv. Math.* **223** (2010), no. 4, 1468–1494.
- [12] L. Beaudet, T. Brüstle and G. Todorov, Projective dimension of modules over cluster-tilted algebras, *Algebr. and Represent. Theory* **17** (2014), no. 6, 1797–1807.
- [13] M. A. Bertani-Økland, S. Oppermann and A. Wrålsen, Constructing tilted algebras from cluster-tilted algebras, *J. Algebra* **323** (2010), no. 9, 2408–2428.
- [14] A. B. Buan, R. Marsh, M. Reineke, I. Reiten and G. Todorov, Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics, *Adv. Math.* **204** (2006), no. 2, 572–618.
- [15] A. B. Buan, R. Marsh and I. Reiten, Cluster-tilted algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **359** (2007), no. 1, 323–332.
- [16] A. B. Buan, R. Marsh and I. Reiten, Cluster-tilted algebras of finite representation type, *J. Algebra* **306** (2006), no. 2, 412–431.
- [17] A. B. Buan, R. Marsh and I. Reiten, Cluster mutation via quiver representations, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **83** (2008), no. 1, 143–177.
- [18] P. Caldero, F. Chapoton and R. Schiffler, Quivers with relations arising from clusters (A_n case), *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **358** (2006), no. 4, 359–376.
- [19] P. Caldero, F. Chapoton and R. Schiffler, Quivers with relations and cluster tilted algebras, *Algebr. and Represent. Theory* **9**, (2006), no. 4, 359–376.

- [20] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras I: Foundations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **15** (2002), 497–529.
- [21] B. Keller, On triangulated orbit categories, *Documenta Math.* **10** (2005), 551–581.
- [22] B. Keller and I. Reiten, Cluster-tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi-Yau, *Adv. Math.* **211** (2007), no. 1, 123–151.
- [23] P. G. Plamondon, Cluster algebras via cluster categories with infinite-dimensional morphism spaces, *Compos. Math.* **147** (2011), no. 6, 1921–1954.
- [24] R. Schiffler and K. Serhiyenko, Induced and coinduced modules in cluster-tilted algebras, preprint, arXiv:1410.1732.
- [25] S. Zito, Projective Dimensions and Extensions of Modules from Tilted to Cluster-Tilted Algebras, arXiv:1608.01616

Department of Mathematics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-3009, USA
E-mail address: **stephen.zito@uconn.edu**